4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

of Christianization, hoping that a common faith would eventually combine all neighboring Slavic tribes under his sway. This ingenious policy soon worried Louis to the point where he sent a Bavarian force against Rostislav in 855, at the same time detailing another detachment to prevent the Czechs from helping him. This punitive expedition was a failure. Rostislav chased the Bavarians out of his territory and became virtually independent. The next few years were too full of complications in the west to allow Louis the luxury of reprisals against Rostislav, who extended his sway along the Danube at the expense of the disorganized Avars, and finally, in 860, deposed the Croat Prince Pribina in favor of the latter's son Kotzel. Since Pribina was loyal to Louis the German, this exploit was carried out under the pretext of making common cause with Louis' rebellious son Carloman, margrave of the Ostmark, who hoped to gain the empire with Slavic support.

In any case, Rostislav was at this juncture the independent chief of a large group of Slavic tribes, not only in Moravia but also south of the Danube. He could not be certain that Carloman, if successful, would deal any more gently with him than did Louis the German. Rostislav's expansion along the Danube had brought him into direct touch with the Bulgarians who, under the Khagan Krum before 814 and his successor Omurtag thereafter, had become a pagan state important enough to maintain diplomatic relations with both Franks and Byzantines. The Bulgarians supported Louis the German against Carloman, and Boris, their prince since 852, was now toying with the possibility of accepting conversion from Byzantium. Rostislav himself had succeeded reasonably well with the political emancipation of his countrymen. What more natural than that he should also seek their religious autonomy by creating a clergy who could use the vernacular, and would perhaps wield the book more efficiently than the sword? For the priests and monks from Salzburg and Passau were at least as good soldiers as they were clerics—the church militant in person.

Rostislav thus seems to have thought of Slavic-speaking mis-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

sionaries as early as 860. There is good evidence that he first applied to Rome in vain. After this failure, he turned to Constantinople, with enormous consequences for the future of Slavic civilization, not so much in his own domains, but throughout eastern Europe and the Balkans. Confronted, after the defeat of Carloman, by a new alliance between Louis the German and Boris of Bulgaria, Rostislav was now so placed that any political contact with the Greek empire, such as might result from closer religious affiliations, could be regarded only as eminently desirable insurance.

A Moravian mission sent by Rostislav reached Constantinople toward the end of 862 and stayed there the rest of the winter. The Eastern empire had been ruled since 843 by Michael III, picturesquely nicknamed the Drunkard despite his military and administrative ability. The chief ecclesiastical and intellectual light of Byzantium in his day was the patriarch Photius, who had held this post since 858. From a political standpoint, the mission was successful. Boris of Bulgaria was detached from his alliance with Louis the German. But the religious results of the mission were even more striking.

At Salonika, in the ninth century the center of an area largely populated by Slavs, there was stationed a Greek *drungarios* or battalion commander of noble birth by the name of Leo. He had two sons, Constantine and Methodius. Constantine had enjoyed a liberal education, studied under Photius himself, and became a professor of philosophy, but later gave up a brilliant scholarly career for monastic orders. He was eventually sent upon a missionary journey to the Khazars, on which he was accompanied by his elder brother Methodius. Likewise well-educated, Methodius had already held the post of district governor in a Slavic-speaking area not far from Salonika, but had abandoned the civil service to become a monk on Mount Athos, which he left only for the mission to Khazaria. The two brothers returned to Constantinople from this mission late in 861, about a year before Rostislav's envoys reached there. Constantine retired to private life, while Me-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

made a ceremonial visit to Constantinople, where she was sumptuously entertained by the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, who has left us a detailed account of the occasion. Her son Sviatoslav, Vladimir's father, remained a convinced pagan, and is best known to history for his overthrow of the Khazar khanate in 962, his extension of Kievan authority to the upper Volga, and his disastrous attempts to subjugate Bulgaria between 968 and 971. He was, in fact, slain by the nomad Pechenegs at the rapids of the Dnieper while returning home from a crushing defeat at the hands of the Byzantine emperor John Tzimisces.

After his father's death Vladimir, who at the time was prince of Novrogod, opened hostilities against his half-brother who had succeeded Sviatoslav, and by his opponent's death became heir to Kiev. Before his conversion he had consolidated his power in the Dnieper valley, confirmed his father's conquest of the region between the Dnieper and the upper Volga, pushed his domains to the northeastern river courses feeding the Baltic, and made important gains at the expense of the Poles in Volhynia and Galicia. His ingenuity transformed a loose confederation with but weak control of its periphery into a unified Russian domain. That this unity was maintained with difficulty under his immediate descendants and was eventually dissolved was a consequence of local particularism aggravated by economic derangement, of feuds in the princely family, and of the pressure of nomad invaders.

The principality of Kiev became a state of European importance by Vladimir's conquests and conversion. The reign of his son Yaroslav the Wise from 1017 to 1054 is the meridian of its greatness. Yaroslav himself was a prince of rare intelligence and broad international contacts. He had himself married Ingigerd, a Swedish princess who had earlier been engaged to King Olaf Haraldsson of Norway. His sister Maria married King Kizimir I of Poland; of his daughters, one married King Henry I of France; a second Harald the Severe, King of Norway; a third King Andrew of Hungary. His son Vsevolod

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

was the husband of a Greek princess, and the son of this union eventually became the consort of Gytha, daughter of the Saxon Harold who fell at Hastings in 1066. Kiev was thus united with contemporary European states by a series of dynastic alliances foreshadowing the customs of modern times.

Yet for all his power and wealth, Yaroslav governed by the same simple mechanism that had prevailed under Vladimir. The prince won his position by force and maintained it by personal supremacy, supported by Varangian mercenaries recruited from Scandinavia whenever domestic levies proved insufficient or disloyal, and consulting with his chief military aides, with the city elders, or with church dignitaries on matters of general policy. Yaroslav began the codification of customary civil and ecclesiastical law, encouraged both translations and original literature, and endeavored without success to emancipate the Russian Church from the Byzantine patriarchate. By his crushing victory over the nomad Pechenegs before the walls of Kiev in 1036, he made the marches of his principality safe for thirty-five years.

Beside rebuilding his father's Church of the Tithe after it was damaged by fire in 1017, he carried out a large-scale construction program which made Kiev one of the most notable medieval cities. His great cathedral of Saint Sophia in Kiev, with its five apses and thirteen cupolas, still contains the largest extant yardage of eleventh-century Byzantine frescoes and a series of remarkably preserved mosaics of impressive beauty. This is the one medieval Russian church which has been exhaustively studied by American archaeologists in coöperation with native Russian colleagues.

The underlying weakness of the Kievan principality lay in the fact that its stability was assured only by the prestige and ability of the ruling prince. There was as yet no sentiment of solidarity, national unity, and group interest which guaranteed that the whole system would not be overthrown by some ambitious and resolute rival from among the kindred princes in outlying cities loosely subject to the authority of the prince of Kiev and envious of his power and wealth.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

Kiev and envious of his power and wealth. Yaroslav himself was unable to obviate this danger. Before his death he endeavored to perpetuate the system his father and he had created by assigning the succession at Kiev to his eldest surviving son, and by apportioning to his younger sons the other important cities in the order of seniority of the princes and of the relative prestige of their several districts, with the recommendation that the younger brothers should regard the eldest as their sovereign and as the arbitrator of eventual disputes. Yet he omitted from his assignment his grandson and the descendants of his deceased brother, who thereupon constituted a potential threat to the tenure of the ruling line, even if the latter managed to keep peace among themselves.

The mode of succession established by Yaroslav thus placed the principality in the hands of a fraternal partnership. The apportionment of domains on the basis of seniority was theoretically feasible, however, only as long as the ruling family was small. But with the normal increase of direct and collateral descendants, mutual jealousies were bound to produce internal strife and to enfeeble the whole structure of the state. Mere seniority was no proof of either innate capacity or of the energy and tact required to allay disputes or to pacify ambitious rivals, and any weakness of the central authority impeded effective resistance to nomad attacks on the southern frontier. These attacks demanded at all times a vigorous defense, since cutting the Dnieper trade route meant decline of trade with Byzantium and interruption of the economic exchanges on which the prosperity of the principality depended. As it turned out, Prince Iziaslav, Yaroslav's son and successor, was unable to keep his rivals in check or even to maintain discipline among the unruly population of his capital. The Pechenegs, abolished as a menace by Yaroslav, were succeeded from 1062 by the nomad Polovtsi, whose boldness depended on what resistance they encountered. The disorders of Iziaslav's principate thus foreshadow a centrifugal movement destined to grow in volume until the preponderance of Kiev was utterly lost.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

175* 643 This process was occasionally delayed, if not arrested, by the appearance of competent princes who reëstablished for brief periods the stability and prestige of Kievan authority. For example, Vladimir Monomakh (1113-1125), grandson of Yaroslav, fought during his entire adult life either against the nomad Polovtsi or to maintain the unity of the principality against his kinsfolk, but such formal agreements as were reached for the assignment of domains to the various princely families were seldom of long standing. At the same time, the minor principalities of the western border were exposed to Polish or Hungarian aggression, and many southern frontier towns in the steppe country were either wiped out by the Polovtsi or abandoned because they might be.

175* 661 567 The confusion which prevailed during the sixty years after Yaroslav's death in 1054 marks the onset of the decline of Kiev. While the feuds and disputes among the kindred princes were fought out by the princes themselves and their servitors, the lower classes of the population—the free peasants and the humble urban artisans—saw their fields laid waste and their earning power curtailed. If one prince occupied by force the domain of another and then was forced to withdraw, he frequently dragged off with him on his retirement the peasantry of the area he had temporarily occupied, and turned them into slaves in his own district. The result was a decrease in the free population and an enormous increase in the number of slaves available for work on princely estates.

175* 162 166 By the end of the reign of Yaroslav the steppe country for one hundred miles or more south of Kiev had been settled by an agricultural population composed partly of free farmers, partly of war captives whom Yaroslav had located there, and partly by semicivilized pagans who had given up their nomad existence to live peacefully among their former foes and to form a sort of border militia. It was on this frontier population that the raids of the Polovtsi fell most heavily. The resulting migration from these exposed positions was most marked after 1125, but it began almost half a century

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

resist both the Tartars and Lithuania, though in his will he did not break entirely with tradition, but bequeathed to his eldest son two-thirds of his landed possessions. Even so, however, the remaining regional princes ceased to be a menace, and the fact that his younger son was bound to serve Basil III as his overlord made the latter "sovereign of all Rus" in fact as well as in name. Such few regional princes as still existed merely held estates with rights of judgment and tribute, and were factually subject to the prince of Moscow. The title of tsar was first used by Ivan III in 1484, and in 1502 his son, Basil II, added the title "autocrat" (*samoderzhets*).

Such is the political, economic, and ideological process by which the power of Kiev was dissipated and, despite the competition of Lithuania, what was once a mere hunting lodge of the princes of Suzdal and Vladimir became the nucleus around which the modern Russian state took shape. It would be idle to pretend that this ideal was not realized without abundant propaganda from the Orthodox clergy who, particularly after the fall of Constantinople, wished to see the Prince of Moscow the head of Orthodox Christianity and the heir of Rome. Under the pressure of this new tradition, Basil III in particular, as the son of a princess of Byzantium, adorned his court with new ceremonial and assumed the device of the doubleheaded eagle which had belonged to his Byzantine forebears.

Thus the personal rule which had its origins in the decline of republican usages in northeastern Russia both before and since the Tartar conquest evolved into an absolutism founded upon dynastic tradition and supported by a nationalistic legend propagated by the church. The Muscovite tsar was not only the owner of his domain; he was God's anointed whom his subjects could approach only with fear and awe. The tsar's will was the will of God. As the heir of the Byzantine emperors, he acquired new authority over the church as the defender of the Orthodox faith. He confirmed the appointment of metropolitans and archbishops, even sometimes naming them without calling church councils, and clerics referred their disputes

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

to his arbitration. Hence the tsardom of Muscovy became the finest flower of caesaro-papism. [643] 175*

While the last remnants of the old feudal regime were not entirely wiped out until Ivan the Terrible waged a war of annihilation against the jealous survivors of the regional nobility who opposed his system, its basis was securely laid before he came to the throne, and we therefore need not concern ourselves for the moment with his neurotic eccentricities or his administrative innovations.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

178 among the limited section of the upper class which was literate,
179 there could have been found a receptive public in whom their ideas could have taken root.

178 Thus, when the Byzantine intellectual influence (such as it was) died away, the Russian Church lost its function as a repository of culture, and never regained it before it was reduced to social impotence in our own day by revolutionaries angered at its pernicious coöperation with the autocracy. Nor had there ever arisen in Russia any fruitful movement of inspired protest on theological grounds which opposed the spirit of individual critical intelligence to the inertia of a dogma-ridden hierachy. All three of these crucial factors in the formation of the Western European outlook (the perpetuation of classical culture in the Middle Ages; humanism and the Renaissance; the Protestant Reformation) fall quite outside the purview of Russian intellectual life until introduced as contributing elements of the Western culture imposed upon Russia by Peter and his successors in the course of the eighteenth century.

175* When the Swedish warrior-merchants moved down the Rus-
177 sian watercourses, they established themselves as the economic and military ruling class in the small towns which the Eastern Slavs themselves had founded at strategic points for trade and defense. The impulse which first unified the Eastern Slavs into what eventually became the principality of Kiev resulted from the Varangian immigration, and though the immigrants were rapidly Russified by intermarriage with the native Slavs, the princes of Kiev still maintained intimate contact with Scandinavia. At the same time, their economic needs kept them in close relations with the Byzantine Empire for a century before the conversion of Kiev and for two centuries and a half thereafter.

177 Although Byzantine culture had its weaker aspects, we are
643 too prone to underestimate its level and its service to the world, since nearly five centuries separate us from its collapse before the onslaught of the Turks. For while Western Europe was going through the painful process of civilizing the Germanic

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

invaders as they fused with the native stocks, the Eastern Empire had grafted upon the legacy of Rome the picturesque and flamboyant features of oriental Christianity. Its autocratic sovereigns were the agents of God on earth under a system which combined in them the attributes of emperor and pope, and this factor ought especially to be borne in mind, because it not only explains the autocratic tradition later set up by the princes of Moscow but also lies at the root of the Russian tendency to attribute to all their rulers a sort of superhuman status. The superlative adulation showered on Joseph Stalin in our own day is in part a remote reflex of Byzantine influence. Then too, Constantinople before the arrival of the Crusaders was the greatest center of material civilization in the occidental world. Its buildings rivaled Rome in its prime. Its highly organized and stratified society, the splendor of its religious observances, its military prowess under the more gifted emperors, and its general atmosphere of wealth could not fail to create a lasting impression on visitors from less advanced regions.

But Byzantine civilization lacked the punch and the drive which characterized the best days of the Roman Empire or the realm of Charlemagne. In intellectual and literary matters the Eastern Empire was conservative. It studied the past without rivaling it with the products of contemporary creative imagination. It was compilatory rather than original. Byzantine scholars were the most learned men of their day, but their learning was accumulative, not productive. Byzantine historians composed voluminous chronicles without evolving a philosophy of history, while Byzantine theologians dissipated their energy on amenities of dogma argued with a bitterness which we should nowadays associate only with partisan politics. The Byzantine Church was more political than the Roman, more closely affiliated with the state, and hence less fundamentally spiritual in outlook. The literary tradition transmitted by the Byzantine Church was stiff and formalistic. and it was the misfortune of medieval Russia that the Byzantine influence was weakened by political events before it was absorbed by the

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

the landlord. In this way, under the early Romanovs, between 1630 and 1650, freedom of agricultural labor was abolished in Russia, and this situation prevailed until 1861.

The Muscovite system suffered a severe blow in 1598 when Theodore, Ivan the Terrible's son, died intestate and the old dynasty tracing its descent from Rurik became extinct. Since the realm and its inhabitants were regarded as the absolute property of the sovereign, the disappearance of the ruling family was a major catastrophe. Any tsar, however legitimately elected by the general assembly convoked by the patriarch of Moscow, was bound to be weakened by his dynastic illegitimacy. Hence with the reign of Boris Godunov began a period of violent revolution which lasted until 1613, largely motivated by the effort of the nobles to free themselves from exactions and restrictions which tradition forced them to endure from a scion of the old line, but which they would not suffer from anyone else.

When Michael, the first of the Romanovs, was finally elected to the throne in 1613, political self-consciousness had developed to the point where there was some realization that the sovereign actually depended on the people and not the reverse. On the other hand, this realization was strongest among the great nobles, the landowners, and the high officials, and they set up the new dynasty at the price of privileges not otherwise obtainable. It is also notable that the rudiments of parliamentary government, typified by a popular assembly, likewise existed in the early years of Michael's reign, but failed to mature because the level of popular political intelligence was not high enough to appreciate that elective representatives of the people had a real weapon in their potential control of finances. Hence there was no protest when the governing class allowed it to lapse. The government became intensely centralized, and with the establishment of serfdom the nobility and the gentry inevitably became a permanent ruling class upon which the crown was dependent. Since townsmen were forbidden to move into the country, and peasants could no longer establish them-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

which taught the late renaissance disciplines on which the Poles themselves were fed. This process culminated in the establishment of a college at Kiev which was founded in 1622 by Peter Mogila, the great Orthodox Bishop of Kiev. An alumnus of this school, Simeon Polotski, who was already known to Tsar Alexis as a scholar and poet, migrated to Moscow in 1663, where he founded a small monastery school, and in 1667 became tutor to the Tsar's eldest son. Simeon was the first influential exponent at Moscow of renaissance scholarship on a Latin basis, and from 1667, when the Ukraine was ceded by Poland to Moscow, the impact of Western influences through Kievan channels was immediately intensified. That this infusion of a new spirit did not take place without violent opposition goes without saying, but destiny was on the side of the progressives, even though progress was appallingly slow.

It is apparent, however, that increasingly broader breaches had been splitting the Chinese Wall of Muscovite self-sufficiency ever since the time of Ivan III. But Peter the Great set out to demolish it with one charge. For a prince of Moscow, his upbringing was exceptional. His education had been fragmentary, but his free contacts with foreign technicians while he lived in the country near Moscow during the regency of his sister Sophia embued him with a profound taste for military and naval science and mechanics. Essentially practical and rationalistic, he departed from Muscovite tradition in caring nothing for the church as a vessel of dogma and used it only insofar as it was adaptable to his purposes. His boundless energy strained toward goals far beyond the comprehension of any but an infinitesimal minority of his subjects, the rest of whom he undertook to reform and modernize by brute force. But he knew Russia could not become a major European power without the knowledge by which to use the fruits of modern technique. This knowledge he literally drove into the Russians at the point of the bayonet. Since his eye was permanently fixed on material progress, he cared little for abstract learning. His idea of literature was propaganda, and the for-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

175* 643 177 eign works translated in his reign were mostly technical handbooks. He insisted on Western European costume, not from any aesthetic consideration, but because it was more practical and more comfortable to work in than the old Muscovite kaftan with its long sleeves. To prosecute his ends, he was obliged to create a bureaucracy whom he recruited from all strata of society, having little regard for origins if they were intelligent and efficient. Russian culture in Peter's day consisted of the tsar and his pathetically small group of specialists working at killing speed and pressure to overcome the national inertia.

484 175* 643 177 But Peter abolished previous restrictions on foreign travel, and young aristocrats were sent abroad to study and to learn how the Europeans actually lived. The tsar traveled in foreign countries himself. Foreign specialists entered the Russian service in unparalleled numbers. His reign brought to light no liberal tendencies, however, since the nobility absorbed the new bureaucracy and strengthened its hold on the national substance. Yet the channel was opened for a new complex of ideas. Peter forced his subjects to go abroad to study engineering and anatomy, and they observed humanity and the mechanism of states. Unsuccessful attempts to limit the absolute power of the throne were made immediately after Peter's death in 1725.

175* 177 535 536 New notions of the amenities of social intercourse and of the pleasures offered by arts, music, the dance, and literature were added to Peter's more materialistic innovations when his daughter Elizabeth came to the throne in 1741, with the result that French civilization acquired a dominance in Russian intellectual life which it began to lose only at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The origins of the Russian ballet go back to 1735, in the reign of Elizabeth's cousin Anna, who also introduced Italian opera, but the French theater reached St. Petersburg in Elizabeth's reign, which also witnessed the beginnings of the native Russian drama composed in the French pseudoclassic vein of Corneille, Racine, and Molière.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

Russian poets with more form than talent now began to celebrate official occasions and generous donors with ponderous odes. Handbooks of French pseudoclassic literary theory, like Boileau's *Art Poétique*, were translated and annotated. The Academy of Sciences, founded by Peter's widow in 1725, included not only imported German luminaries, but the first Russian natural scientist Michael Lomonosov, sometimes characterized as the Russian Franklin, but whom, on account of the universality of his talent, Pushkin, greatest of Russian poets, called "Russia's first university." He is also notable as the first proletarian in secular Russian letters, for he started his career as a poor fisherman's son far north on the White Sea. The first modern Russian history was composed during the reigns of Anna and Elizabeth by Basil Tatishchev, a former collaborator of Peter the Great. The purely intellectual progress in the thirty years after Peter's death was thus considerable, even though (with rare exceptions) it was confined to the aristocracy.

It is a matter of record that when Catherine II came to the throne in 1762 she was already familiar with the theories of the eighteenth-century French political philosophers and would have welcomed an opportunity to apply them. But her position had been won wholly by the aid of the landed gentry and the aristocratic guard regiments, who were unlikely to surrender any of their prerogatives or to consent to any mitigation of the institution of serfdom on which their economic existence was based. The great empress thus contributed little to social progress, and her educational innovations remained for the most part on paper. Yet through her interest in the satirical journal and in the drama, she stimulated the progress of Russian letters even if her social initiatives were weak. In that field others carried the torch. A Russian customs official, Alexander Radishchev, who had studied at Leipzig and digested the liberal philosophy of the day, in 1780 fired the opening gun against serfdom, and though the exploit sent him to Siberia, its echoes did not die away until the institution was abolished. At the same time, the spirit of social service inspired

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

in Yugoslavia, where it has two aspects: one external—that concerned with relations between Moscow and Belgrade, the other internal—the *entente* between Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.

The personality of Marshal Tito, who had the confidence of the Russians and was the animator, first of resistance to the Germans, then of the liberation movement, considerably simplified the question of relations between Yugoslavs and Sovietics.

Before the soil of Yugoslavia had been liberated, a Government-in-exile (presided over, at the end, by Dr. Ivan Choubachich) continued to function in London, whilst in Yugoslavia Marshal Tito directed the war of liberation. During the winter of 1944–1945, King Peter II tried to bring about an agreement between Tito and the exiled Government. Various obstacles retarded the conclusion of the agreement, and they were later on to paralyse its enforcement.

These obstacles included the conduct of the King during the war. He was reproached with having lived far removed from his people and with not having imitated the example of his grandfather, King Peter I of Serbia, who in 1876 under the name of 'Peter Mrkognich', led a detachment of rebels in Bosnia-Herzegovina, or his father, the Regent Alexander, who had fought in 1917–1918 on the Salonica front.

He was further reproached with his inopportune marriage, contracted far away from the country, and against the advice of his friends and counsellors. On March 21,[o] 1944, at the Yugoslav Embassy in London, he had married Princess Alexandra of Greece, who, on July 17 of the following year, gave birth to a son.

Now, in Serbia, dynastic loyalty is not (as in Croatia, for example) founded on any fundamental attachment to the monarchical idea. It exists simply in respect of the monarch's patriotic function—what the Serbs call *narodni rad* ('national work')—a name which takes on its full significance only in a country which is periodically reduced to slavery.

The authority of King Peter II was also weakened by the support he had given to General Draja Mihaïlovich. The latter had been the first to rise against the occupation, and his heroic resistance had rallied the best elements of the old army in Southern Bosnia and in Montenegro. But he was reproached

[o] March 20, according to Keesing (trans.).

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

725 648 175 with 'Great Serbian' and 'reactionary' tendencies. Subsequently a much more serious charge was made against him; carried away by his struggle against the Communist elements, he was said to have parlied with the Occupying Authorites and with the agents of Nedich, the Serbian 'Quisling'. General Mihailovich was nevertheless the War Minister *in partibus* to the London Cabinet, where the accusations brought against him were never seriously considered until Churchill[1] echoed them. They were the basis of the case brought against his partisans in July, 1945, and the severe sentence passed against them.

[829] Then there was, between the London Government and the 'Tito Movement', the psychological opposition between the exiled politicians (except those of Czechoslovakia) and the insurgents, who, remaining within the country, risked their lives day in and day out. The latter were inclined to see the 'London people' as theorists, if not profiteers of the Resistance, who, in assured comfort and relative security, carried out a paid task with the pen or by radio.

[668] Finally, Tito's partisans merged, in many cases, with the Communist or extremist elements, for whom the old Yugoslav political formations and their staffs embodied a régime of despotism, patronage, and reaction, whose return to power would have constituted an historical retrogression.

643 661 648 175 However, the break did not come immediately. Although King Peter agreed, under pressure from the Allies and especially from Russia, to disown Mihailovich, he showed greater hesitation in negotiating with Tito, whose republican trend and attachment to the Soviet régime were well known.

On June 16, 1944, he resigned himself, rather against his convictions, to authorising Choubachich to sign an agreement with Tito, which provisionally safeguarded the rights of the Crown. On the following November 1 he agreed to the formation of a National Union Government in liberated Yugoslavia. But he reserved his approval as to the nomination of a Regency and the exercise of political power by one single party, the National Liberation Front, until a Constituent Assembly should have met. On this point he even entered into conflict with his

[1] 'General Mihailovich, I regret to say, has gradually adopted a changed attitude, and certain of his leaders have parlied with Italian or German troops'. (Speech in the House of Commons on February 22, 1944.)

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

own Government, which he forced to resign. The Choubachich Cabinet disregarded this and on January 23, 1946 published a communiqué, according to which the sovereign would not return to the country until a Constituent Assembly had pronounced on the question of the régime. In his absence, the royal power would be delegated to a Council of Regency whose members would be chosen from the London Government and from the Tito Government.

On January 30 the King finally agreed to this formula, as recommended by Moscow, London, and Washington.

Then Choubachich went to Belgrade to agree with Tito on the names for the new Government. Prolonged and painful haggling resulted in the formation of the Provisional Cabinet on March 7, in which Tito kept the Presidency and the War Ministry, while Choubachich assumed control of Foreign Affairs. A Serbian democrat, Milan Grol, and a Croat Agrarian, Choutei, entered the new administration.

Yugoslavia was to be reconstituted on a federative basis; the State itself officially took the name of 'Democratic and Federal Yugoslavia'. So the constitution of the 'Yugoslav' Government was followed by the formation of 'National' Governments, six in number—Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Macedonia. Care had been taken not to give this federal organisation a statute and frontiers, on account of the conflicts these would not have failed to provoke; the National Assembly would, in due course, decide upon the internal structure of the State.

It remained to be seen whether Tito would bring to the management of affairs the eminent qualities of which he had given proof in the Resistance. Would history salute him not only as a detached figure in the epic background against which the tragedy of the Serbian nation is played, but also as a reconstructor of the State?

Born in 1893 in the Croat village of Klanyets, Joseph Broz was the son of an artisan. He had known hardship in his youth, and soon exhibited a revolutionary temperament. At seventeen he engineered a strike, and showed himself to be an agitator. It is said that he took his appellation of 'Tito' from the bishop of medieval Crete whose relics rest in the Church of St. Mark in Venice. Taken prisoner by the Russians in 1914, he took part

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

175 in the Bolshevist Revolution, and distinguished himself in the
•643 attack on the Kremlin. He fought on all the Soviet fronts, from the Caucasus to Finland. He married a Russian, who died, leaving him a son of Soviet nationality (who, for his part in the defence of Moscow in 1941, was to win the title of 'Hero of the Soviet Union').

He returned to Croatia in 1924 and took his place as a militant in the Communist and Trade Union ranks. Arrested for illegal propaganda, he served four years' imprisonment. As soon as he was liberated he went to Paris, travelled in various European countries, and returned to France in 1936, charged with the organisation of the so-called 'railway' for supplying volunteers to the International Brigades in Spain.

When he learned of the capitulation of Yugoslavia in 1941, he returned to Zagreb and launched a summons for a general revolt. He had two interviews with Mihailovich, but the Communist and Proletarian ideology which he openly professed frightened the Serbian general—no basis for agreement was possible.

176 The Serbian rising began on July 7, 1941. On that day was
643 constituted, in the region of Belgrade (the seat of the partisans'
C68 general staff), the first formation destined to embark upon the struggle with the invader and to continue it until he was crushed. Tito proved to be an irresistible organiser and 'live wire'; his influence grouped around him a veritable army, whose numbers increased daily, and constantly deprived the Occupying Authorities of food supplies and communications.[2] Starting with 35,000 men, Tito's army was to number 700,000 at the liberation. This epic is one of the most glorious pages in the history of the Yugoslav people—and they already possess not a few.

175 Not only did Tito enjoy the confidence of the Russians, who
648 considered him as one of themselves, but he was in constant
643 touch with the Allies. The first English mission reached him on May 27, 1943, during its fifth offensive. At the very end of 1943 Churchill placed his son with Tito, to assist him during the most

[2] At Bihach, on November 27, 1942, he declared: 'Our country is enslaved, our people the victims of a fruitful terror. Barefoot, starving, bloodless, they are at the mercy of the occupiers and their acolytes. But their determination to live is unshakeable, because they believe in victory'.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

critical hours of the campaign. The liberation army effected its junction with the Russian Army during the final offensive, and entered Belgrade with it on October 20, 1944.

The next day appeared a communiqué, issued as the result of the Moscow discussions, announcing the agreement of British and Soviet views regarding Yugoslavia, on the following basis:—

Union between the Royal Government and the Liberation Movement.

The right of the Yugoslav people to decide their own future constitution.

The United States Government gave its consent to these arrangements. Marshal Tito, who was in Moscow during the Conference, several times discussed them with Stalin and the Soviet leaders.

On April 11, 1945, Russia and liberated Yugoslavia signed a treaty of mutual assistance and collaboration which preserved their traditional policy of *entente*, as well as their united efforts against Hitler's Germany.[3] It formed part of the system of pacts concluded by the Soviet Union with Great Britain, France, and Czechoslovakia, to raise a barrier against any fresh effort on the part of German imperialism to threaten the liberty of the European peoples. The experience of the past, confirmed by this war, showed that in all German plans for aggression, the conquest of the Southern Slav countries was a step towards the domination of the Continent. The fact that Yugoslavia had awaited the year 1940 to establish diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. had opened in South-East Europe a breach which had enabled the enemy to disintegrate Balkan solidarity and to force his way through to the Eastern Mediterranean. Hence Article 2 of the treaty provided for immediate and effective mutual assistance in the event of one of the parties being involved in military operations against Germany, if that country resumed her

[3] About the middle of December 1943, the Yugoslav Government, exiled to Cairo, and then presided over by Bojidar Pourich, had proposed to Moscow a pact of mutual assistance on the model of that which had been concluded between the U.S.S.R. and the Czechoslovak Republic. The Kremlin declined this proposal. At that time Tito was, in their eyes, the sole authentic representative of the Yugoslav nation. On this occasion it was recalled that the Soviet Government had already, in the spring of 1942, raised the question of a pact with the Yugoslav Government in London; at that time it was the latter which had opposed a demurrer.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

National Front 80–90 per cent of the votes cast.[4] It is true that the Opposition abstained from voting (its Belgrade organ, *Demokratia,* was suspended) and that the electoral system favoured the Coalition Government. But the Anglo-Americans took no action. They declared the results of the poll to be 'acceptable'. On these results were based the two Assemblies (Union Assembly and Assembly of the Nationalities) which, following Russian lines, were to control the country's constitutional life.

In short, both at home and abroad, Tito was master of the situation. He had armed forces, the levers of control, fanatical partisans, a 'Youth' following, attached to a régime which had radically reorganised the whole staffing of the army, the administrative services, and diplomacy. But certain large sections of opinion were not with him. In the provinces the old parties were still solidly rooted. Those circles criticised the 'personal' and 'plebiscite' character of the régime, which was an unprecedented innovation in Serbian political life. Against the Marshal were the Monarchists, the old army, Serbian nationalism, Croat particularism, Slovene 'Clericalism'. For a long time he alienated the Catholic clergy; on October 18, Radio-Vatican broadcast a letter from the Yugoslav bishops to the Belgrade Government, accusing the latter of systematically persecuting the Roman Church.

And this was only criticism of internal affairs. Tito was further reproached with having reorganised relations between the Yugoslav populations on anachronistic bases. How would this State turn out—a State of twelve million inhabitants, with six autonomous Governments, capped with a Federal Government? Where would the frontiers of Croatia and Serbia be? And those of Serbia and Macedonia? Could the Macedonian question be considered as settled by the granting of autonomy? And would not the Bulgaro-Yugoslav *entente,* advertised as a victory for the régime, be submitted to a severe test when autonomy gave rise to political disputes in this country which, for a century, had been torn by undercurrents of passion and foreign intrigue? Was

[4] According to official statistics, out of 8,383,455 electors and 7,413,214 votes cast, 6,574,975 went to the National Front. The franchise had been given to women; the electoral age had been lowered to 18, and even lower for those who had fought in the liberation.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

the resurrection of Montenegro, a country of 200,000 inhabitants, which had disappeared since 1918, and of Bosnia, which had not been heard of in history since the Middle Ages, in keeping with the ideas of a 'new world' that were current in Tito's circle? And had not Tito himself, by liberating atomic nationalisms, super-Balkanised his country at a time when means of communication were suppressing distances—in other words, had he not inaugurated a policy which was opposed to history, progress, and common sense, in order to realise the midsummer night's dream of a Slavophile of the 'Forties'?

The federal régime, it will be said, has representatives in Europe—Switzerland, Russia, Austria. But Switzerland has maturity, Russia has extent, Austria has an historical and cultural homogeneity to safeguard its unity.

Was not the Yugoslav community in imminent danger from this 'State power' given to regions hitherto divided by so many memories? The Croats used to oppose the Serbs in religious matters. Between the two wars, rivalry between Catholics and Orthodox had subsided somewhat. But the elections in Austria and Hungary showed that, after the liberation, the attachment of the populations of Central Europe to the Roman Church had lost none of its force. Croatia—*antemurale Christianitatis*—could not escape this deeply-rooted tendency, still less at a time when Russia, the protectress of the Yugoslav State, reaffirmed the Orthodox tradition on which her relations with the Serbs had formerly been based. How was it possible not to see in this renewal of religious antagonism between Belgrade and Zagreb a threat of secession?

In Yugoslavia the Crown used to be (as in Belgium) the link between different peoples, traditions, and trends. On November 29, 1945, obedient to Tito's watchword, the Yugoslav Constituent Assembly, composed of the Union Assembly and the Assembly of the Nationalities, proclaimed the Federative Republic. It deposed and condemned to exile the dynasty of the Karageorgevich.

This vote was the logical conclusion of the elections and also—it must be admitted—of the errors of the young King. The latter raised a protest which was greeted, in London circles, with more sympathy than encouragement. The fate of the monarchy in Yugoslavia seemed, indeed, to be definitely settled.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

642
829

Marshal Stalin sent his congratulations to Tito and his good wishes to the 'sister nation' of Yugoslavia. The establishment of the republic was greeted everywhere as a victory for the spirit of democracy. In actual fact it is hard to believe that there is more 'democracy' in the Balkan republics than in the Scandinavian or British monarchies.

000

The real question still remains to be seen—whether Tito's régime ensures a new lease of life for Yugoslav unity or whether it portends, sooner or later, a disruption of that unity, which might this time be irreparable. It is by no means impossible that in the next few years, even months, the evolution of Yugoslav life may be characterised by a gradual weakening of the ties between the Serbs and the Croats and a correlative strengthening of solidarity between Serbs and Bulgars—in other words, by an end of the union of Southern Slavs, and an attraction of part to the East.

On the international scale, the future of Yugoslavia is at the mercy of the super-powers who are the arbiters of peace. So that all depends on the importance which the Balkan world holds in the policy of Russia who, in Central Europe and in Asia, is occupied with interests of far wider scope. And here it is as well not to forget that, during the time of the Tsars, the Balkan peoples always bore the brunt of all efforts at *rapprochement* between Russia and Austria-Hungary. Will they, tomorrow, form the medium of exchange between the U.S.S.R. and the Anglo-American democracies, without whose capital it would be difficult for them to exploit their natural resources?

* * *

Of all the liberated Slav States, it was, as might be expected, Czechoslovakia which showed most practical sense. She managed her return to liberty without any unnecessary clashes or violence.

642
643
175

No serious difficulty arose between the London Government-in-exile and the Resistance. On May 8, 1944, Benes signed an agreement with Moscow concerning the administration of the liberated territories. On the following October 29 he declared that, after the war, the affairs of the Republic would be so organised as to avoid a repetition of the events of 1938. 'Czechoslovakia will be a fully decentralised Republic, organised

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

on the basis of respect for the principle of nationalities'. No reference to a federal system.

He returned to Czechoslovakia early in March, 1945, and, from Kosice, he followed the last stages of the liberation. On May 10 the national flag again floated from Prague Castle and Cathedral; a few days later Benes made a triumphal entry into the city.

The Government (formed on April 5, under the presidency of M. Fierlinger, and composed of twenty-five members, seven of whom were Communists) avoided the mistake made by the majority of the liberated countries, by postponing the elections until passions had had time to subside a little. The authorised political parties, four in number, agreed on the allocation of mandates to the Provisional National Assembly, which numbered 300 deputies, including 100 for Slovakia. On April 14[1] an electoral body chosen by the local National Committees nominated the members of this Assembly. 'The Czechs', Benes said, 'must take radical measures, while at the same time avoiding extremism'. That was the whole programme of the Czechoslovak Popular Front.

In the international order, the Government observed the same prudence. Benes's realistic attitude towards Soviet Russia is well known. 'The Czechs are a Slavonic people, and they are specially drawn towards the Russians, whom they understand better than any other people'. But Czech culture, and the democratic education of the Czech people, are fundamentally Western. The President continually returned to that assumption. Czechoslovakia is an intermediary region between two civilisations; its historical evolution, its psychology, its intellectual and social structure, all have affinities with the Anglo-American and French democracies.

The Soviet orientation was represented by the Communists, under the leadership of the Deputy Prime Minister, M. Clement Gottwald, and the Minister of National Education, Zdenek Nejedly, a celebrated musicographer, who attended the Moscow Panslav Congresses. But their influence was exerted moderately, and solely on the lines of the national interest. In reality, the Czech people, with their habits of thrift, their appreciation of property, their aversion to conformity, are fundamentally opposed to the Marxist ideology.

1 [1945 -- Analyst]

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

It is true that, on resuming possession of the liberated capital, M. Benes affirmed his intention of remaining faithful to the ideas of the new policy of union with the great Russian nation and with the other Slavonic peoples. But such statements need reading in the context of his previous declarations.

Had not the President himself, in an article in *Foreign Affairs* (October, 1944), uttered a warning against any distorted interpretation of his words? 'We must not abandon our old method of evolutive adaptation and our old policy of balance between East and West. Our geographical position does not allow us to make a sudden change in this century-old policy'.[5]

A new fact had previously arisen, which was to turn the scale slightly in favour of Russia. This was the annexing of Carpatho-Ruthenia to the Ukraine. Czechoslovakia thus became one of Russia's neighbours; there arose between the two countries a community of strategic and economic interests, which modified the equilibrium of Central Europe. Benes had always said that Russia's non-participation in the 1919–1920 settlements had distorted the general view of that equilibrium. His judgement was proved correct—probably even more so than he anticipated. When, on December 12, 1943, he had signed the Czecho-Russian treaty of friendship and mutual aid, he had understood that liberated Czechoslovakia would be restored to her pre-1938 frontiers. But, at the time of the treaty on June 29, 1945, which, without any plebiscite or international consultation, transferred Ruthenia to Soviet sovereignty, M. Molotov had put forward arguments based on ethnography, linguistics, folklore, and history, to which Prague could not but submit. Moreover, had they been consulted, the vote of the Ruthenians would not have been in doubt. So Fierlinger, the Prime Minister, recognised that 'the time had come for Ruthenia to return to her homeland, the great Soviet Ukraine'. He forbore to add that she had been separated from it for a thousand years, and he passed over the heavy sacrifices that Czechoslovakia had made

[5] Compare this declaration with the one Benes had made in February 1944, to the diplomatic editor of *Reynolds' News*: 'Our pact with Russia is a fundamental consolidation of the Czechoslovak Republic. And we consider that, at the same time, it strengthens our independence. . . . Our friendship with U.S.S.R. does not mean that we depend on that country; on the contrary, the pact institutes reciprocal collaboration with our State, which desires to live in real, sincere friendship with Russia, while safeguarding its full sovereignty'.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

for twenty years in order to raise the economic standard of this 'Ukrainian Piedmont'. And in November, 1945, the National Assembly, without any vain recriminations, ratified the transfer of sovereignty.

In addition to all that, Czechoslovakia risked losing the Teschen Basin, occupied on October 2, 1938, by Polish troops, and still in dispute between the two countries. But, in the spirit of Slav solidarity (not of conquest) which had, in 1920, installed Czechoslovakia in Carpatho-Ruthenia, she was enabled to cast her eyes on that minority—Serbian or Sorabian or Wend—of Lusatia, whose 80,000 survivors still peopled 1,900 square miles between Bautzen and Cottbus. A Sorabian 'National Committee' was formed in Prague with a view to attaching this territory to Czechoslovakia. But had not the Poles, too, claims to put forward to this detached tribe of the ancient Slavonic community?

In any case, Czechoslovakia could not be reproached with having derived benefit from her fidelity to the Slavonic idea; although, in 1918, that fidelity had ensured for her the rebirth of her national life, in 1945 it brought her nothing but amputations. But was not the good grace with which she accepted the loss of her Eastern province (by a treaty in which M. Molotov saw 'a striking manifestation of the sincere friendship of the Slavonic peoples') a demonstration of her disinterestedness, and did it not prove that her Slavism was free of any expansionist or Chauvinist speculation?

On the other hand, in spite of some rather imprudent expressions on the part of M. Nejedly ('We belong to the great Slavic bloc, controlled by the Russian nation'), the Prague Government endeavoured to protect the individuality of the country from political or ideological domination. It repeatedly asked the Soviet Authorities to hasten evacuation of their troops. It lost no opportunity of protesting against allegations which represented it as a 'satellite' of Moscow. 'A good many people come here with the idea, which is quite unfounded, that the Russians control us', said President Benes to the World Congress of Students. 'The real truth is much simpler; there is no need to seek startling explanations for our decision to conduct our own business as we think fit'. As a more characteristic gesture, and one which requires no commentary, in October, 1945, he

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

sent to London a military mission under General Svoboda, the Commander-in-Chief, to renew contacts with the British General Staff, and to ask the latter to co-operate in the reconstitution of the Czechoslovak Army.

In short, of all the liberated Slav nations, Czechoslovakia was the one which had most clearly marked out the contours of her independence in the New Europe. She accepted neither 'synchronization' nor enfeoffment. Without disavowing either her Slavonic affinities or her traditional attachment to Russia, she restored her relations with the West to their 1938 footing.

An intermediary State, Czechoslovakia is carving out her path between the Russian and the Anglo-Roman worlds; nearer to the former by her security reflexes and her views on the future of Europe, she is nearer to the latter by her spiritual unrest, her philosophy of life and her conception of progress.

* * *

The rapid tour which has taken us from Warsaw to Sofia and from Belgrade to Prague is sufficient to clarify speculations founded on the birth of a Slavonic 'Imperialism'.

Once again, it is official eloquence which has nourished these speculations. There was not a Polish, Czech, Yugoslav, or Bulgarian statesman who did not see, in the issue of the Second World War, the end of the curse which, for a thousand years, paralysed the expansion of the Slavonic world. Not one who did not celebrate the establishment and the benefits of an inter-Slav *entente*. Let us quote a few of these heroic declamations at random.

In the first rank was Poland—no doubt because this was the nation which, from the Slavonic point of view, had the worst memories to atone for. Commenting on the signature of the Polish-Sovietic agreement, the head of the Government of the Polish Republic regretted that his country had not, at the time of the German aggression, frankly taken her stand beside the Soviet Union, in order to form a 'Slavonic bloc'. 'This grave political error', he declared, 'caused a great deal of suffering to the Slavonic peoples and, most of all, to Poland'.[*]

[*] When, on July 15th, the new Polish Ambassador handed his credentials to the Regent of Yugoslavia, he alluded to 'Germany, the eternal enemy of the Slavs'. This was an undeniable historical truth; but how fail to recall, on hearing it invoked, the importunate shadows of Beck and Stoyadinovich?

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

for Foreign Affairs spoke in similar vein in the House of Commons. And the final result of all this fuss was simply that England and the United States were not represented at the inaugural session of the Third Polish Republic, held on February 4. Moreover, that did not prevent those two countries from offering their congratulations, the next day, to M. Boleslaw Bierut, President of the Republic. London and Washington had never had any other concern than that of 'saving appearances'. They knew quite well that these platonic manifestations of displeasure would have no other effect than to consolidate Muscovite influence in Warsaw.

The Presidency of the new Government was entrusted to a young member of the Cracow bar—M. Joseph Cyrankiewicz, General Secretary of the Socialist Party, and a survivor of the Auschwitz Camp. In May, political life was gradually becoming normal. The President of the Republic compared it to a river 'which, after having been diverted from its bed by a cataclysm, was finding its true course again'.

To the new Cabinet was to fall the mission of getting the Oder-Neisse frontier sanctioned by the Peace Conference. In its own view, as well as that of the whole of Poland, the question was settled by the fact that transfers of population had already taken place, without any protests from London or Washington. It was difficult to conceive that millions of Displaced Persons would be compelled to undergo a fresh exodus. The Anglo-Americans would therefore be obliged, in Mr. Churchill's phrase, 'to write off Eastern Europe on the Profit and Loss account'. Moreover, France supported the Polish viewpoint; on February 19, 1947, she signed a cultural agreement with Warsaw—the preface to a new political pact, it being understood that Poland would support her claims on the Saar, as she would back up those of Poland to the maintenance of her western frontier. The question of the frontiers gave rise, in April, 1947, to a bitter and sterile passage-of-arms between Americans and Russians at the Moscow Conference.

Another and no less redoubtable motive of discord between

dates which fell to the Socialo-Communist bloc which backs the regime of Bierut and Osubka-Morawski. So the Moscow-controlled parties get 400 out of the 444 seats in the Polish Diet. . . . The last vestiges of Polish liberty, for which General Sikorski is still fighting, will tend to disappear'.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

helplessness; Benes capitulated before Gottwald's ultimatum. It was the end of the Putsch which Hubert Ripka later described as a 'prefabricated revolution'. On March 9[1] Jean Masaryk, Minister of Foreign Affairs, wrote a personal letter to Stalin, in which he denounced the intervention of Zorine, the Soviet Ambassador, in the events of February: 'When a time of mortal danger for the country, and for all Slavs, comes, you will have in Prague nothing but a Government hated by the country, despised by the *élite*, and relying entirely on the bayonets of its police organisations'. The next day Masaryk committed suicide: contradictory versions of his death were circulated, although the above-mentioned letter had made clear his intention of ending his life.

Thus the inspirer of two Czech liberations, heir to the thought of Thomas Masaryk, disappeared in shameful oblivion; the commentaries in the Communist press, in which he was later accused of having betrayed the interests of the country, lead us to wonder whether his inglorious end did not save him from an even more tragic fate. Posterity will pronounce a mixed judgment on his political achievement. His tomb might fittingly have been engraved with this epitaph, taken from one of his books (*Whither the Slavs?*): 'The existence and the prosperity of all the Slav States is inseparably bound up with a régime of true democracy, that is to say, a régime in which the elementary principles of individual liberty, liberty of conviction, liberty of religion, liberty of political expression and liberty of public opinion, are guaranteed and fully respected'.

As for Benes, whose authority was henceforth without scope, on June 7, 'for health reasons', he resigned his presidential office, which he had held since June 19, 1946, in a message by which he invited his fellow-citizens 'to encourage liberty and consciously enjoy it'. He died a few months later, on September 3, 1948.

The events of February were to be mentioned at the United Nations Security Council, with a view to appointing a commission of inquiry—which was opposed by a Soviet veto (May 24).

On March 9, 1948, was voted the Constitution which made Czechoslovakia a 'democratic peoples' republic'. It instituted a Single House system, and proclaimed the equality of Czechs and Slovaks: the republic was to be a bi-national State. Unlike

1 [1948 - Analyst]

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

graphical errors and boundless imagination, fed on Byzantine and autocratic Imperial doctrines, decided for a long time the style of Russian political thought. Hence, practically, the Moscow Tsar and later the St. Petersburg Emperor became the head of the church of a Byzantine Caesaro-Papist type and assumed the position of a Byzantine theocrat. The conception of absolute power coming from God, absolute in the universalistic sense, meaning that the monarch was the ruler of all material goods as well as of human souls, became established in Russia particularly in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, after the period of the Mongolian yoke had excellently prepared the ground for such a conception of monarchical power. As the ultimate result of these events Moscow represented the type of an Oriental despotism with a tendency toward state control characteristic of these organizations (especially at the time of the *oprichnina* of Ivan the Terrible and later) and the equally characteristic tendency towards imperialism based on Byzantine religious and historical premises.

These bonds with Byzantium became particularly strong after, and in connection with, the marriage of Ivan III to Sophia Paleologus, the Byzantine princess in exile whom Ivan III received from Italy. This marriage is also an interesting story. Both Rome and Venice were still meditating a war against the Turks in order to liberate Byzantium. For the realization of this new, grandiose enterprise the help of the already developed might of Moscow appeared very desirable. Moscow had succeeded at that time through all sorts of belligerent activities and political manoeuvres in establishing its predominance among Russian princes and was on the eve of liberating Muscovy from the Tartar yoke. Led by western political conceptions, Rome and Venice thought that the good will of Ivan III could be bought by the offer of the title of *king*, and on the other hand by a marriage with a Byzantine princess who after the death of the legitimate heir to the Byzantine Empire would become vested with the right to the Byzantine throne.

7; Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

Ivan III was not very much interested in the European title of *king*, which did not mean very much to him. Moscow was so far away from the habits, manners, and international hierarchy of Europe that European distinctions and collaboration with Europe could not awake real interest in the exotic Muscovite state. On the other hand, Sophia Paleologus was considered by the Pope as a zealous Catholic; Ivan III needed a pure Orthodox fiancée. This last thing, however, was settled, and in 1472 Sophia Paleologus, the princess of Byzantium, the presumably zealous Catholic girl, became the Tsarina of Moscow and the most zealous of Orthodox ladies. The offers of the title of *king* interested Ivan, however, from one special point of view, from the very one which caused great discomfort in Cracow. Ivan III was supposed to become king or even emperor of the whole Russian nation *(in tota Ruthenica natione)*. As I have said, Ivan III was not interested in the title, as he was not even very anxious to buy from the direct heir of the Byzantine throne the rights to the throne, and Andrew Paleologus had to sell them elsewhere. But the formula in *tota Ruthenica natione* awakened some interest, curiosity, and appetite in Moscow.

Ivan III had two reasons for being interested in this suggestion. The first one was connected with the fact that some of the lands which belonged to the Polish King and Grand Duke of Lithuania (in one person, as the King of Poland was at the same time the Grand Duke of Lithuania from the time of the union between Poland and Lithuania) represented ancient *votchinas*, appanages, of the Rurikoviches, that is, of the ancestors of Ivan III. Moscow viewed this circumstance as making possible the expansion of the Muscovite Tsardom, and it opened the door to Russian, Muscovite territorial pretensions and demands.

On the other hand the Ruthenians who populated these lands were descendants of people who had been Christianized from the eastern source; therefore, they were Orthodox. The Union of Florence included them, but not to Moscow's thinking. Therefore Moscow saw in them the object of a religious mission, and that